





## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignita 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,057	09/13/2000	Akira Ohtani	Q60771	7619
. 75	07/10/2003			
Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20037-3202			EXAMINER	
			CHOWDHURY, TARIFUR RASHID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2 44		N. K.			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/661,057	OHTANI ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Tarifur R Chowdhury	2871			
The MAILING DATE f this c mmunication appears n the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 26 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amoust the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	, , ,	•			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		•			
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 2,3 and 5-8.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. $\hfill \square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on $\_\_\_$ is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	V			
10. Other:		there hay			
		T. Chowdhry Primary Examin			



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arugement is not persuasive because the comparison applicant proviodes in the response i irrelevant since the limitation such as the liquid and solid alicyclic epoxy resin not containing aromatic group is not in the claim. Further, Suzuki discloses that alicyclic epoxy resin is advantageous since it is low in viscosity and high in castibilit. Further, Yuji also discloses the use of liquid epoxy resin and solid epoxy resin. Therefore, the rejection was proper..